



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/586,028

05/22/2007

Dirk Hanisch

Y06Y002PCT-US

1794

35910 7590 01/08/2009

Omori & Yaguchi USA, LLC

8 Penn Center

1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd

Suite 1300

Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, MARK A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/08/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/586,028	Applicant(s) HANISCH, DIRK	
	Examiner MARK A. WILLIAMS	Art Unit 3673	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 5-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 15-18 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ilea et al., US Patent 7,192,066, in view of Weis, US Patent 4,930,961.

Ilea et al. provides a motor vehicle door lock component provided for connection to a vehicle door, in which the motor vehicle door lock component comprises a carrier plate 32 whereon locking pieces (34, 100, 42) are mounted, and a lock housing 30 which at least partially surrounds the locking pieces comprising the carrier plate, characterized in that a counter piece formed from the side of the lock housing, which is opposite to the carrier plate is provided in such a way that it co-operates with a connection element (136, 128) in the vehicle door by means of a through opening (132, 134, 128) in the carrier plate. Inside the connection counter piece a bearing is inherently provided for the thread of a bolt extending through the through opening. The carrier plate is formed from a shape-retaining material. The

carrier plate is formed by a frame box of a motor vehicle door lock. Regarding the Outsert method, as claimed, such a limitation constitutes a product by process limitation, and does not further limit the invention, since what matters is the resulting structure, not the method by which the structure is achieved (see MPEP 2113). Product by process limitations are also found in each of claims 9-14, thus not limiting that particular aspect of the claims accordingly.

The particular claimed form of the counter piece and seat are not provided by Ilea. However, it is old and well known in the art of connections to use such shaped connecting members to achieve a desired fastening result. Weis provides the claimed structure with counter piece (10, 11), seat 32, and connection element B. Such structure provides a quick lock and release connection, as known in the art. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the device in this way, for the purpose of providing an effective means of a quick lock and release connection, as known in the art.

Regarding claim 8, although the housing and plate arrangement of Ilea is provided as a motor housing, and not for a catch and pawl arrangement, it would have been obvious to use a similar housing/plate arrangement as in Ilea, modified

to a catch and pawl as conventional in the art, for the purpose of providing sufficient housing and connecting structure for a catch and pawl assembly.

Regarding claims 10, 11, 12, and 14, although the claimed coating, transportation fixing with snap-in projection, and noise-reducing layer are not explicitly provided by the combination, the examiner serves Official Notice that such structures are very old and well known in the art of vehicle door components, including latches, for their known utilities, including providing paint and/or seal finish, blocking of sound, and additional means of ease of connection. It would have been obvious to include such modifications in the device, for the purpose of achieving known utility in the design, including providing paint and/or seal finish, blocking of sound, and additional means of ease of connection.

Election/Restrictions

3. Newly submitted claims 15-18 are directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: the claims are directed to a method, classified in 296/190.06 and would require additional burdensome examination and/or searching.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original

presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 15-18 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the Outsert method greatly improves the overall economic efficiencies and quality in the parts production, and none of the applied art cites such a method as claimed. However, it is the position of the examiner that such a limitation constitutes a product by process limitation, and does not further limit the invention, since what matters is the resulting structure, not the method by which the structure is achieved (see MPEP 2113). Therefore, it is not necessary that the applied art provide the particular claimed method of construction, but the final product, or equivalent thereof.

Applicant has not argued the examiners serving of Official Notice. Therefore it is the position of the Office that applicant concedes the examiner's serving of Official Notice as proper, and is considered Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MARK A. WILLIAMS whose telephone number is (571)272-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patricia Engle can be reached on (571) 272-6660. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patricia L Engle/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3673

/Mark A. Williams/
Examiner, Art Unit 3673

<div>Application Number</div> <div></div>	Application/Control No.	Applicant(s)/Patent under Reexamination	
	10/586,028	HANISCH, DIRK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MARK A. WILLIAMS	3673	